

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
COLUMBIA DIVISION

Marie Assa'ad-Faltas,

PLAINTIFF

v.

Henry Dargan McMaster, et al.,

DEFENDANTS

Case No. 3:20-cv-01809-TLW

**Order**

Plaintiff Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, proceeding *pro se*, filed this civil action against South Carolina's governor, attorney general, house speaker, and supreme court chief justice, asking for prospective relief on at least nine separate topics, which she seeks to litigate through a class action consisting of eight separate classes, all of which is summarized in her four-page complaint. ECF No. 1. The matter now comes before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) filed by the magistrate judge to whom this case was assigned. ECF No. 7.

In the Report, the magistrate judge recommends that the Complaint be dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. After the magistrate judge filed the Report, Plaintiff filed objections.<sup>1</sup> ECF No. 10. This matter is now ripe for decision.

In reviewing the Report, the Court applies the following standard:

---

<sup>1</sup> Along with her objections, she filed over 4,400 pages of exhibits, the relevance of which is non-obvious. *See* ECF Nos. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16.

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to the Court, to which any party may file written objections . . . . The Court is not bound by the recommendation of the magistrate judge but, instead, retains responsibility for the final determination. The Court is required to make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the report and recommendation to which no objections are addressed. While the level of scrutiny entailed by the Court's review of the Report thus depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case the Court is free, after review, to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations.

*Wallace v. Hous. Auth. of City of Columbia*, 791 F. Supp. 137, 138 (D.S.C. 1992) (citations omitted).

In light of the standard set forth in *Wallace*, the Court has reviewed, *de novo*, the Report and the objections. After careful review of the Report and the objections, for the reasons stated by the magistrate judge, the Report is **ACCEPTED**. Plaintiff's objections are **OVERRULED**. Her Complaint is hereby **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**<sup>2</sup>

*s/ Terry L. Wooten*  
Terry L. Wooten  
Senior United States District Judge

December 18, 2020  
Columbia, South Carolina

---

<sup>2</sup> Plaintiff has also filed a motion seeking recusal of the magistrate judge and the undersigned. ECF No. 15. There is no merit to this motion and it is **DENIED** for the reasons set forth by the magistrate judge in the Report. ECF No. 7 at 28–30.